arXiv:0908.0165v1 [math.GT] 2 Aug 2009

DISCRETE AUTOMORPHISM GROUPS OF CONVEX CONES OF FINITE TYPE

EDUARD LOOIJENGA

Abstract. We investigate subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ which preserve an open nondegenerate convex cone in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and admit in that cone as fundamental domain a polyhedral cone of which some faces are allowed to lie on the boundary. Examples are arithmetic groups acting on selfdual cones, Weyl groups of certain Kac-Moody algebras and do occur in algebraic geometry as the automorphism groups of projective manifolds acting on their ample cones.

Introduction

This story begins with the seemingly innocuous Theorem 2.2, which might have a place in the theory of linear programming. It is easily stated, even in an introduction: if V is a finite dimensional real vector space, $L \subset V$ a lattice and C is an open nondegenerate convex cone in V, then the convex hull of $C \cap L$ is locally polyhedral in the sense that its intersection with any bounded polyhedron is a polyhedron. This is our basic tool for our investigation of the linear automorphism groups Γ of C which preserve L and possess a natural finiteness property. The latter has a number of equivalent formulations, one of which is that there exists a finite subset of L in the closure of C such the cone it spans has a Γ-orbit that contains C. This turns out to be self-dual property: the same is then true for the contragradient action of Γ on V^* relative to the duals of C and L. Since the invariant lattice L is secondary to the resulting $\mathbb{Q}$-structure $V(\mathbb{Q})$ on V, we call $(V(\mathbb{Q}), C, \Gamma)$ a *polyhedral triple.*

Examples of polyhedral triples abound and provide sufficient justification for investigating this situation in its own right, even if the motivation lies elsewhere (more on this at the end of this introduction). First of all we have the case when C is a self-dual homogeneous cone and Γ is an arithmetic subgroup of the automorphism group of C (the most classical instances of which are perhaps the Lobatchevski cones and the cone of positive definite quadratic forms in a fixed number of variables). Another class of examples constitute the cones attached to irreducible Coxeter groups that are neither finite nor of affine type (these are indeed nondegenerate convex). Related to this class of are the hyperbolic reflection groups studied by Vinberg and Nikulin. A number of examples occur in algebraic geometry by taking for V

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 52C07, secondary: 20H05.

Key words and phrases. convex cone, arithmetic group.

the Neron-Severi space of a projective manifold, for C its ample cone and for Γ the image of the representation of automorphism group of the manifold.

We find that many properties of arithmetic groups acting on self-dual homogeneous cones subsist in the much more general setting of our polyhedral triples.

The first section recalls (or discusses) the elements of the theory of convex sets. In Section 2 we prove the basic theorem stated above. Its first applications are in Section 3. The following section introduces the central notion of this paper (that of a polyhedral triple) and we derive a number of properties of the corresponding group. In Section 5 we determine the structure of a stabilizer of a face, with most of our results being summed up by Theorem 5.1.

We believe that there should even be a more general (and arguably more natural) setting in which the present discussion can be carried out, namely for open convex sets in an affine space that come with a discrete group of automorphisms admitting a (not necessarily bounded) polyhedron with some improper faces as fundamental domain (so that in particular, it is no longer assumed that there is an invariant lattice). The reader may feel free to take this as a challenge.

This paper intends to be the first installment of a series on semi-toric compactification. It is a 'spin-off' of my ancient unpublished preprint [7] to the extent that it is only about the geometry of discrete groups acting on convex cones, the complex-analytic story being relegated to sequels. My justification is that I believe that this material forms a natural whole and that the results have an interest of their own, independent of the motivating application originally envisaged (namely to develop a common generalization of the compactifications of Baily-Borel and Mumford *et al.* of locally symmetric varieties).

1. Groups Convex Cones and Kernels

We begin with recalling some definitions that are standard in the theory of convex sets. A subset C of a real finite dimensional vector space V is called a *cone* if it is nonempty and invariant under scalar multiplication with positive numbers (so C need not contain the origin). The set of linear forms on V that are ≥ 0 on C is a closed convex cone in the dual vector space V^*. It is called the *cone dual to* C and denoted C^*. The interior of this dual is denoted C°, to which we shall refer as the *open dual* of C. It is set of linear forms whose zero set meets the closure of C in the origin only.

Let A be a finite dimensional real affine space. Given a convex subset $\mathsf{X} \subset \mathsf{A}$, then the *relative interior* of X is the interior of X in its affine span; we denote it by $\dot{\mathsf{X}}$. If this happens to be X, then we say that X is *relatively open.* A *face* of X is a nonempty subset Y of X with the property that every segment in X which meets Y is either contained in Y or meets Y in an end point. A face is closed in X and any intersection of faces of X is a face of X. If $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is the restriction of an affine-linear function, then the set of points of X where f assumes its infimum is a face of X, but not every face of X is necessarily of that form. A face that can be so obtained is called *exposed*. A point of X that makes up a face resp. an exposed face by itself is also called an *extreme* resp. *exposed point* of X. We say that X is *nondegenerate* if it does not contain an affine line.

We denote by $\mathrm{T}(A)$ the vector space of translations of the affine space A and extend the range of that notation as follows. If X and Y are subsets A, then we denote by $\mathrm{T}(X, Y) \subset \mathrm{T}(A)$ the set of translations that take X to Y. Notice that this is a semigroup when $Y = X$. If X is convex, then it is also a cone (if $t \in \mathrm{T}(A)$ is such that $t + X \subset X$ and $\lambda > 0$, then choose an integer $n \geq \lambda$; we have $nt + X \subset X$ and then also $\lambda t + X \subset X$ by convexity), called the *recession cone* of X, and often denoted $\mathrm{T}(X)$ instead (as we did for $X = A$). The recession cone of a *bounded* convex set is clearly reduced to the origin. According to [11], Thm. 8.4, the converse holds for any convex subset that is closed (and hence also when it is relatively open). In that case $\mathrm{T}(X)$ has a simple geometric interpretation: if we compactify A to a topological ball by adding as boundary the topological sphere of rays in $\mathrm{T}(A)$, then the closure of a closed convex $X \subset A$ intersects that boundary sphere in the subset defined by $\mathrm{T}(X)$. We can also express this as follows: if $\tilde{\mathsf{T}}(A)$ denotes the dual of the space of affine-linear functions on A, so that A is naturally embedded in $\tilde{\mathsf{T}}(A)$ as an affine hyperplane and $\mathsf{T}(A)$ is embedded in $\tilde{\mathsf{T}}(A)$ as the linear hyperplane parallel to A, then the closure of the cone spanned by X meets $\mathsf{T}(A)$ in $\mathsf{T}(X)$.

The following related notion is also useful.

Definition 1.1. Let X be a subset of a finite dimensional real affine space A. Then the *asymptotic space* of X is the intersection of all the linear subspaces $W \subset \mathrm{T}(A)$ for which the image of X in the affine quotient A/W is bounded. We denote this subspace $\mathrm{As}(X)$.

In other words, the space $\mathrm{As}(X)$ has the property that X is contained in $\mathrm{As}(X) + \mathrm{B}$ for some bounded set $\mathrm{B} \subset A$ and it is minimal for that property. Notice that we can also characterize $\mathrm{As}(A)$ as the common zero set of the linear parts of the affine-linear $\mathbb{R}$-valued functions on A whose restriction to X is bounded.

It is clear that $\mathrm{As}(X)$ contains $\mathrm{T}(X)$. But the latter need not span the former. For instance, if X is the solid parabola in $\mathbb{R}^2$ defined by $y > x^2$, then $\mathrm{T}(X)$ is the nonnegative y-axis, whereas $\mathrm{As}(X) = \mathbb{R}^2$

The convex hull of a subset Z of a subset of an affine space will be denoted by $[Z]$. The notions convex and convex hull admit a straightforward 'relativization' in the situation where we have a subset Z in the total space V-principal bundle with base B, where V is a vector space; we then denote the convex hull of Z relative to B by $[Z]_B$.

In the remainder of this section, V is a finite dimensional vector and C an open nondegenerate convex cone in V. Then C° is nondegenerate as well and we have $(C^\circ)^\circ = C$.

In Section 2 we shall need the following lemma.

Lemma 1.2. *Let $V' \subset V$ be the asymptotic space of some subset of C. Then V' is the asymptotic space of $(B+V')\cap C$ for every nonempty bounded $B \subset C$. Moreover, if F the smallest face of $\bar{C}$ which contains $\bar{C}\cap V'$ and V^F denotes the common zero set of the $\xi \in C^*$ with $\xi|F = 0$, then $V' \subset V^F$.*

The proof will in fact show that this characterizes the asymptotic spaces of subsets of C: if F is face of $\bar{C}$, then every subspace $V' \subset V^F$ with the property that $\bar{C}\cap V'$ is not contained in a smaller face than F is the asymptotic space of a subset of C.

We begin with:

Lemma 1.3. *Let F be a face of $\bar{C}$ and let $V^F \subset V$ be as in Lemma 1.2 above. Then for any $p \in C + V^F$ and $q \in \dot{F}$ there exists a $\lambda > 0$ such that $p + \lambda q \subset C$.*

Proof. Suppose no such λ exists. Then $(p+\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}q)\cap C = \emptyset$. So either $p+\mathbb{R}q$ is disjoint with $\bar{C}$ or meets $\bar{C}$ in a ray in $p+\mathbb{R}q$. In either case, there exists (by [11], Thm. 11.5 resp. Thm. 11.6) a linear form ξ on V which is positive on C and ≤ 0 on a ray in $p+\mathbb{R}q$. This implies that $\xi(q) = 0$. Since $\xi|C > 0$, we have $\xi|V^F = 0$, and hence $\xi|C + V^F > 0$. But this contradicts the assumption that $p \in C + V^F$ and the fact that $\xi(p) \leq 0$. □

Proof of 1.2. Let $P \subset C$ be such that V' is its asymptotic space and let F be as in the lemma. We first prove that $V' \subset V^F$. Since V^F is the annihilator of a face of the dual of C, πC is an open nondegenerate convex cone in V/V^F. The minimality assumption on F implies that $\pi\bar{C}\cap\pi V' = \{0\}$. Since $\pi\bar{C}$ is the closure of πC, it follows that the projection $\pi\bar{C} \to V/(V^F+V')$ is proper. As the image of P in $V/(V^F+V')$ is bounded, it follows that πP is bounded. So V^F must contain the asymptotic space V' of P.

It remains to show that V' is the asymptotic space of $(B+V')\cap C$. In other words, we must show that any $\phi \in V^*$ whose restriction to $(B+V')\cap C$ is bounded is zero on V'.

Choose $p \in B$ and $q \in \dot{F}\cap V'$. Then the ray $p+\mathbb{R}_{>0}q$ is contained in $(p+V')\cap C$, and hence ϕ is bounded on this ray. This means that $\phi(q) = 0$. Since $q \in \dot{F}$, there exists by Lemma 1.3 for every $u \in V'\cap V^F = V'$ a $\lambda > 0$ such that $\lambda q + u + p \subset C$. Since $|\phi(u+p)| = |\phi(\lambda q + u + p)|$, it follows that the restriction of ϕ to the affine-linear subspace $p+V'$ is bounded and hence constant. So ϕ vanishes on V'. □

Definition 1.4. A *kernel* for C is by definition a nonempty convex subset K of $\bar{C}$ with $0 \notin \bar{K}$ and $K + C \subset K$. (N.B. Our definition differs slightly from the one of Ash [1], in that he does not insist that K be convex.) Two kernels

K_1 and K_2 for C are said to be *comparible* if $\lambda K_1 \subset K_2 \subset \lambda^{-1} K_1$ for some $\lambda > 0$.

It is clear that comparibility is an equivalence relation.

For any subset K of V we let $K^\vee$ denote the set of $\xi \in V^*$ with $\xi | K \geq 1$. If K is a kernel for C, then it is easy to see that $K^\vee$ is a closed kernel for C°. Furthermore, if K_1 and K_2 are comparible kernels, then so are $K_1^\vee$ and $K_2^\vee$.

Lemma 1.5. *If* K *is a kernel for* C*, then* $K^{\vee\vee} = \bar{K}$.

Proof. Although this is essentially [11] II.5.2 Prop.1, we give a proof for completeness. Let us prove the nontrivial inclusion $K^{\vee\vee} \subset \bar{K}$. If $x \notin \bar{K}$, then there exists by the separating hyperplane theorem [11], Thm. 11.5, a $\xi \in V^*$ with $\xi(x) < \inf_K \xi$. It is clear that then $\inf_{\bar{C}} \xi \geq 0$ (and hence $\inf_K \xi \geq 0$). If $\inf_K \xi > 0$, then normalize ξ such that $\inf_K \xi = 1$. Then $\xi \in K^\vee$, and since $\xi(x) < 1$, we have $x \notin K^{\vee\vee}$. Suppose now $\inf_K \xi = 0$ (so that $\xi(x) < 0$). The preceding argument applied to $x = 0$ yields a $\xi_0 \in V^*$ with $\inf_K \xi_0 = 1$. Choose $t > -\xi_0(x)/\xi(x)$. Then $(\xi_0 + t\xi)(x) < 0$ and $\xi_0 + t\xi \in K^\vee$. So in this case $x \notin K^{\vee\vee}$ also. □

Closed kernels have certain technical advantages over arbitrary ones and for that reason the following lemma is quite useful.

Lemma 1.6. *Let* Λ *be a discrete subset of* $\bar{C}$*. Then the convex set* $[\Lambda] + \bar{C}$ *is closed in* V *and every extreme point of* $[\Lambda] + \bar{C}$ *is exposed and belongs to* Λ*. Moreover, every face of* $[\Lambda] + \bar{C}$ *is of the form* $[M] + F$*, where* $M \subset \Lambda$ *and* F *is a face of* $\bar{C}$*.*

Proof. Let K denote the closure of $[\Lambda] + \bar{C}$. We first show that every exposed point p of K is in fact in Λ. By the definition there exists a $\phi \in V^*$ with $\phi(p) < \phi | K - \{p\}$. Since $p + \bar{C} \subset K$, it follows that ϕ is positive on $\bar{C} - \{0\}$. This means that $\phi | \bar{C}$ is proper. Since Λ is closed in $\bar{C}$, it follows that $\phi | \Lambda$ has a minimum. This is then also the minimum of $\phi | K$, and so we must have $p \in \Lambda$.

Following Straszewicz's theorem [11], Thm. 18.6, the exposed points of K are dense in the set of extreme points of K. Since Λ is discrete, this implies that every extreme point of K is an exposed point of K. It now follows from [11], Thm. 18.6, that $K \subset [\Lambda] + \bar{C}$. The last assertion is a consequence of [11], Thm. 18.5. □

2. Convex Sets and lattices

The main result of this section is Theorem 2.2 below, which may not strike the reader as surprising. Nevertheless, we shall see that it has interesting consequences, such as the *Siegel property* 3.8.

Before we can state the result alluded to above, we recall resp. introduce some terminology pertaining to polyhedra.

Definition 2.1. A *polyhedron* in a real finite dimensional affine space is a subset of that can be defined by finitely many affine-linear inequalities; if the affine space is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ and these affine-linear forms are definable over $\mathbb{Q}$, then we call this a *rational* polyhedron. Every bounded polyhedron is the convex hull of a finite subset of the affine space, and it is rational if and only if that subset consists points with rational coordinates. A subset of the affine space is said to be *(rationally) boundedly polyhedral* if its intersection with every bounded (rational) polyhedron is a (rational) polyhedron.

Theorem 2.2. *Let V be a real finite dimensional vector space, $\mathsf{C} \subset \mathsf{V}$ an open nondegenerate convex cone and $\mathsf{L} \subset \mathsf{V}$ a lattice. Then $[\mathsf{C} \cap \mathsf{L}]$ is a boundedly rationally polyhedral subset of V (relative to the $\mathbb{Q}$-structure on V defined by L). In particular, $[\mathsf{C} \cap \mathsf{L}]$ is closed in V.*

It will be convenient to prove a few preparatory results first. We denote by $\rho : \mathsf{V} \to \mathsf{V}/\mathsf{L}$ the obvious map.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathsf{R} \subset \mathsf{V}$ be a half line which is not contained in a proper linear subspace of V defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, and B a neighborhood of 0 in V. Then $[(\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{R}) \cap \mathsf{L}]$ is a neighborhood of R in V.*

Proof. It is a well-known fact that the image of a line in V not contained in a proper linear $\mathbb{Q}$-subspace of V has dense image in V/L. The same is true for a half line in such a line, such as R. Let x be a generator of R. We show that $[(\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{R}) \cap \mathsf{L}]$ is a neighborhood of $p + x$ in V.

To this end, we choose nonempty open subsets $U_1, \dots, U_N$ of $\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{R}$ such that for every $(u_1, \dots, u_N) \in U_1 \times \dots \times U_N$, x is in the interior of the convex hull of $u_1, \dots, u_N$. Since $\rho(U_i + \mathsf{R}) = \mathsf{V}/\mathsf{L}$, there exist $u_i \in U_i$ and $t_i > 0$ with $u_i + t_i x \in \mathsf{L}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. So $u_i + t_i x \in (\mathsf{B} + \mathsf{R}) \cap \mathsf{L}$ and the interior of the convex hull of $0, u_1 + t_1 x, \dots, u_N + t_N x$ contains x. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let Y be a nonempty convex subset in V whose affine-linear span A is a coset of its asymptotic space. Then $\rho\mathsf{Y}$ is dense in $\rho\mathsf{A}$.*

Proof. We may assume that Y is relatively open. We construct inductively a complete flag $\{0\} = \mathsf{V}_0 \subset \mathsf{V}_1 \subset \mathsf{V}_2 \cdots \subset \mathrm{As}(\mathsf{Y})$ in $\mathrm{As}(\mathsf{Y})$ such that $\rho(\mathsf{Y} + \mathsf{V}_{i-1})$ is dense in $\rho(\mathsf{Y} + \mathsf{V}_i)$. This clearly suffices.

When V_i has been constructed with $i < \mathrm{As}(\mathsf{Y})$, then consider the image Y_i of Y in V/V_i. By our assumption, Y_i is an unbounded convex set. It is also relatively open and so by [11], Thm. 8.4, $\mathrm{T}(\mathsf{Y}_i) \neq \{0\}$. Let $\mathsf{R}_i \subset \mathsf{V}$ be a ray mapping to a ray in $\mathrm{T}(\mathsf{Y}_i)$ and let V_{i+1} be the linear span of V_i and R_i. Since $\rho(v + \mathsf{R}_i)$ is dense in $\rho(v + \langle \mathsf{R}_i \rangle)$ for any $v \in \mathsf{V}$, it follows that $\rho(\mathsf{Y} + \mathsf{V}_i) = \rho(\mathsf{Y} + \mathsf{V}_i + \mathsf{R}_i)$ is dense in $\rho(\mathsf{Y} + \mathsf{V}_{i+1})$. □

Proof of theorem 2.2. We prove the theorem with induction on $\dim \mathsf{V}$. Since the theorem is trivial if $\mathsf{V} = \{0\}$, we assume that $\dim \mathsf{V} > 0$. According to 1.6, $[\mathsf{C} \cap \mathsf{L}] + \bar{\mathsf{C}}$ is closed in V. We fix a face P of $[\mathsf{C} \cap \mathsf{L}] + \bar{\mathsf{C}}$.

Step 1. The face P is also a face of $[\mathsf{C} \cap \mathsf{L}]$. In particular, the affine span of P is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Proof. According to Lemma 1.6, we have $P = [P \cap L] + F$, with F a face of $\bar{C}$. So it is enough to prove that for every $p \in P \cap L$ and every ray R in F, $p + R \subset [C \cap L]$. Denote by V_R the smallest subspace of V defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ which contains R and let B be a convex neighborhood of 0 in V_R such that $p+B \subset C$. According to Lemma 2.3, $[(p+B+R)\cap L]$ contains a neighborhood of $p + R$ in V_R. Since $p + B + R \subset C$ it follows that $p + R \subset [C \cap L]$. □

Note that if we apply Step 1 to $P = [C \cap L] + \bar{C}$, we find that $[C \cap L] = [C \cap L] + \bar{C}$ is closed in V.

We write V' for the asymptotic space of P, W for the smallest subspace of V defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ that contains V' and $\pi : A \to A/W$ for the projection. So πP is bounded and πL is a lattice in A/W.

Step 2. $P = \pi^{-1}\pi P \cap [C \cap L]$.

Proof. Clearly, the translation space of the affine span $\mathrm{Aff}(P)$ of P contains V'. Since the former is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, it contains W as well. This implies that $\pi^{-1}\pi P \cap [C \cap L]$ equals $\mathrm{Aff}(P) \cap [C \cap L]$. Since P is closed, the latter is just P. □

Step 3. $[\pi C \cap \pi L] = \pi[C \cap L]$.

Proof. We prove the nontrivial inclusion $\subseteq$, that is, we show that if $p \in C$ is such that $(p + W) \cap L$ is nonempty, then $(p + W) \cap C \cap L$ is nonempty.

Choose an open bounded neighborhood B of 0 in W such that $p + B \subset C$. According to Lemma 1.2 V' is the asymptotic space of $(p + V') \cap C$. If we combine this with Lemma 2.4 we see that $\rho((p + V') \cap C)$ is dense in $\rho(p+V')$. The latter is dense in $\rho(p+W)$. Hence so is $\rho((B+V')\cap C)$. Since B contains a nonempty open subset of W, it is also open and so we have an equality: $\rho((B + V') \cap C) = \rho(p + W)$. Hence $\rho((p + W) \cap C) = \rho(p + W)$. The right hand side contains 0 (for $p+W$ meets L) and so we conclude that $(p + W) \cap C \cap L \neq \emptyset$. □

Step 4. πC *is nondegenerate.*

Proof. Suppose not: then the closure of $T(\pi C)$ contains a line $l \subset V/W$. Choose $p \in P \cap L$. It follows from Lemma 2.3 that $\pi(p) + l$ is in the convex hull of $\pi C \cap \pi L$. By step 3, this convex hull is just $\pi[C \cap L]$. Let $y \in l - \{0\}$. Since πP is bounded, there exists a $\mu > 0$ such that $\pi(p) \pm \mu y \notin \pi P$. Let $p_\pm \in [C \cap L]$ be such that $\pi(p_\pm) = \pi(p) \pm \mu y$. Then $\frac{1}{2}p_- + \frac{1}{2}p_+ \in \pi^{-1}\pi(p) \cap [C \cap L] = P$ by step 2, although $p_\pm \notin P$. This contradicts the fact that P is a face of $[C \cap L]$. □

Step 5. If P *is unbounded, then* $\mathrm{Star}(P)$ *has only finitely many members and makes up a neighborhood of* $\dot{P}$ *in* $[C \cap L]$.

Proof. Since P is unbounded, $W \neq \{0\}$, and so $\dim V/W < \dim V$. Step 4 enables us to apply our induction hypothesis to πC and πL. Since $[\pi C\cap\pi L] = \pi[C \cap L]$ (step 3), we find that $\pi[C \cap L]$ is a boundedly rationally polyhedral subset of V/W. So the star of πP in $\pi[C \cap L]$ consists of finitely many faces whose union makes up a neighborhood of the relative interior of $\pi(P)$ in $\pi([C \cap L])$. This implies the corresponding property for P with respect to $[C \cap L]$. ☐

Step 6 (Conclusion). We show that any bounded polyhedron Π in V meets only finitely faces of $[C \cap L]$. Suppose that on the contrary, there exists a sequence $P_1, P_2, \dots$ of pairwise distinct faces of $[C \cap L]$ with $P_i \cap \Pi \neq \emptyset$. We claim that $\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} P_i$ is not bounded: otherwise $(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} P_i) \cap L$ is finite, and as each P_i is the convex hull of its intersection with L, only a finite number of P_i's could be distinct. This property is of course also true for any subsequence of $(P_i)_i$. So, after perhaps passing to a subsequence, we can find sequences $\{p_i \in P_i \cap \Pi\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ converging to some $p_\infty \in \Pi$ and $\{q_i \in \dot{P}_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that the intervals $[p_i, q_i]$ converge to a ray R emanating from p_∞. Let P_∞ denote the face of $[C \cap L]$ whose relative interior contains $R - \{p_\infty\}$. As P_∞ is unbounded, $\mathrm{Star}(P_\infty)$ is by step 5 a neighborhood of $\dot{P}_\infty$, and so $q_i \in |\mathrm{Star}(P_\infty)|$ for i sufficiently large. So for such i, $P_i \supset P_\infty$. According to step 5 only finitely faces of $[C \cap L]$ have that property, and so we get a contradiction. ☐

3. Convex cones in rational vector spaces

In this section V is a real finite dimensional vector space with a $\mathbb{Q}$-structure $V(\mathbb{Q})$. A *lattice* in V is always understood to be compatible with this $\mathbb{Q}$-structure, in other words, must be subgroup of $V(\mathbb{Q})$ of rank equal to $\dim V$.

We also fix an open convex nondegenerate cone $C \subset V$. The convex hull of $\bar{C} \cap V(\mathbb{Q})$ clearly contains C; we denote it by C_+. Similarly we have $C_+^\circ \supset C^\circ$ in V^*. We say that a subset K is *locally rationally polyhedral* in C_+ if for every rationally polyhedral cone Π in C_+, $\Pi \cap K$ is a rational polyhedron.

Proposition 3.1. *For every lattice* L*,* $[C \cap L]$ *is a kernel for* C *and all such kernels belong to the same comparibility class.*

Proof. It is easy to see that $[C \cap L]$ is a kernel. If L' is another lattice, then there exists a postive integer k such that $kL \subset L' \subset \frac{1}{k}L$. So $k[C \cap L] \subset [C \cap L'] \subset \frac{1}{k}[C \cap L]$. ☐

Definition 3.2. A kernel for C is called a *core* if it is comparible with the convex hull of the intersection of C with some lattice in V. It is called a *cocore* if its dual is a core for C°. Notice that given a lattice L in V, then $[C^\circ \cap L^*]^\vee$ is a cocore which contains the core $[C \cap L]$.

Definition 3.3. A collection Σ of convex cones in C_+ is said to be a *locally rationally polyhedral decomposition* of C_+ if the following conditions are fulfilled:

(i) the relative interiors of the members of Σ are pairwise disjoint and their union is C_+,
(ii) Σ is closed under intersections and taking faces,

(iii) if Π is a rationally polyhedral cone in C_+, then $\Sigma|\Pi := \{\sigma \cap \Pi\}_{\sigma\in\Sigma}$ is a finite collection of rationally polyhedral cones.

If moreover every $\sigma \in \Sigma$ is a rationally polyhedral cone, then we omit the adverb "locally", and call Σ a *rationally polyhedral decomposition* of C_+.

Remark 3.4. Notice that the collection of faces of C_+ is a locally rationally polyhedral decomposition of C_+ which is refined by any other locally rationally polyhedral decomposition of C_+.

Proposition 3.5. *Let* $L \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$ *be a lattice. Given a face* $P \neq \emptyset$ *of* $[C^\circ \cap L^*]$, *let* $\sigma(P)$ *denote the set of* $x \in V$ *such that* $\xi \in [C^\circ \cap L^*] \mapsto \xi(x)$ *assumes its infimum on all of* P. *Then* $\sigma(P)$ *is a rationally polyhedral cone,* $\dim \sigma(P) = \operatorname{codim} P$, *and* $P \mapsto \sigma(P)$ *is an injection which reverses inclusions. Moreover, the collection* $\Sigma(C, L) := \{\sigma(P)\}_P$ *is a rationally polyhedral decomposition of* C_+.

Before we begin the proof we show:

Proposition 3.6. *If* L *is a lattice in* $V(\mathbb{Q})$, *then* $[C^\circ \cap L^*]^\vee$ *is a locally rationally polyhedral cocore for* C.

This will be a consequence of the following result (we shall need it in this general form later in the proof of Proposition 4.12):

Lemma 3.7. *Let* A *be a real finite dimensional affine space,* P *a polyhedron in* A, *and* Φ *a collection of affine-linear functions on* A *that are* ≥ 0 *on* P *and such that for every* $p \in P$ *and every* $t \in T(P)$, *the sets* $\{\phi(p)\}_{\phi\in\Phi}$ *and* $\{d\phi(t)\}_{\phi\in\Phi}$ *are discrete. For every finite subset* S *of* Φ, *we let* P_S *be the set of* $p \in P$ *such that all* $\phi \in S$ *assume in* p *in the same value and no member of* Φ *takes in* p *a smaller value. Then* $\{P_S\}_{S\subset\Phi}$ *is a finite polyhedral decomposition of* P *and* $\{p \in P \,|\, \phi(p) \geq 1$ *for all* $\Phi\}$ *is a polyhedron.*

Proof. Let $p_1, \dots, p_k$ enumerate the (finite) set of extreme points of P, and let $t_{k+1}, \dots, t_l \in T(P)$ generate $T(P)$ as a cone. Consider the subset of $\mathbb{R}^l$ defined by

$$\Xi := \{(\phi(p_1), \dots, \phi(p_k), d\phi(t_{k+1}), \dots d\phi(t_l)) \,|\, \phi \in \Phi\}.$$

By assumption the projection of Ξ on every coordinate is discrete and contained in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. An inductive argument shows that there exists a finite subset Ξ_0 of Ξ such that $\Xi \subseteq \Xi_0 + \mathbb{R}^l_{\geq 0}$. So if Φ_0 is a finite subset of Φ which maps onto Ξ_0, then, for every $\phi \in \Phi$ there exists a $\phi_0 \in \Phi_0$ such that for all i, j, $\phi(p_i) \geq \phi_0(p_i)$ and $d\phi(t_j) \geq d\phi_0(t_j)$. In other words $\phi \geq \phi_0$ on P. Hence every nonempty P_S is obtained by taking $S \subset \Phi_0$, and all such cover P. The set of $p \in P$ with $\phi(p) \geq 1$ for all $\phi \in \Phi$ is already defined by restricting the index set to Φ_0 and is therefore a polyhedron. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.6. Let $\Pi \subset C_+$ be a polyhedral cone in C_+. We must show that $\Pi \cap [C^\circ \cap L^*]^\vee$, that is, the locus of $p \in \Pi$ with $\xi(p) \geq 1$ for all $\xi \in C^\circ \cap L^*$ is polyhedral. Since Π is contained in a rational polyhedral cone in

C_+, we may assume it is such a cone. It is now enough to show that Lemma 3.7 applies here. If $p \in C \cap L$, then clearly the set of $\{\xi(q) : \xi \in C^\circ \cap L\}$ is a set of positive integers. So if p is a convex linear combination of such q, then $\{\xi(p) : \xi \in C^\circ \cap L\}$ is in a semigroup of $\mathbb{R}$ which is finitely generated as such. Hence it is discrete as a subset and bounded from below. □

Proof of Proposition 3.5. We only prove the last statement, for everything else follows in a straightforward manner from 2.2. For $\lambda \in \bar{C} \cap L$, $\{\xi(\lambda) | \xi \in C^\circ \cap L^*\}$ is obviously a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. So for $x \in [\bar{C} \cap L] = C_+$, $\{\xi(x) | \xi \in C^\circ \cap L^*\}$ is still a discrete subset of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. This implies that $\xi \in [C^\circ \cap L^*] \mapsto \xi(x)$ has a minimum, so that $x \in \sigma(P)$ for some face P of $[C^\circ \cap L^*]$. This proves property (i) of 3.3. Property (ii) is easy. As for (iii), let Π be a rationally polyhedral cone in C_+. Then $\Pi \cap [C^\circ \cap L^*]^\vee$ is a rational polyhedron by 3.6. Since $\sigma(P) \cap \Pi$ is the cone over a face of $\Pi \cap [C^0 \cap L^*]^\vee$ or reduced to the origin, the collection $\{\sigma(P) \cap \Pi\}$ is finite and consists of rationally polyhedral cones. □

Here is an interesting application.

Theorem 3.8 (Siegel property). *Let Γ be a subgroup of* $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ *which leaves* C *and a lattice in* $V(\mathbb{Q})$ *invariant. Then* Γ *has the* Siegel property *in* C_+*: if* Π_1 *and* Π_2 *are polyhedral cones in* C_+ *and* F_i *denotes the face of* C_+ *whose relative interior contains the relative interior of* Π_i*, then the collection* $\{\gamma\Pi_1 \cap \Pi_2 | \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ *is finite and the set of* $\gamma \in \Gamma$ *with* $\gamma\dot{\Pi}_1 \cap \dot{\Pi}_2 \neq \emptyset$ *is a finite union of right* $Z_\Gamma(F_1)$*-cosets (hence also a finite union of left* $Z_\Gamma(F_2)$*-cosets). In particular,* Γ *acts properly discontinuously on* C*.*

Proof. The first assertion follows from the second if we apply it to the relative interiors of the (finitely many) faces of Π_1 and Π_2. In order to prove the second assertion, we first observe that the set of $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $\gamma\dot{\Pi}_1 \cap \dot{\Pi}_2 \neq \emptyset$ is indeed a union of right $Z_\Gamma(F_1)$-cosets (and also of left $Z_\Gamma(F_2)$-cosets). Let $L \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$ be a Γ-invariant lattice. Since $\dot{\Pi}_i$ is covered by finitely many members of $\Sigma(C, L)$ whose relative interiors are contained in $\dot{F}_i$, we may assume that $\Pi_i \in \Sigma(C, L)$, $i = 1, 2$. If now $\gamma\dot{\Pi}_1 \cap \dot{\Pi}_2 \neq \emptyset$, then we must have $\gamma\Pi_1 = \Pi_2$. So we only need to show that $N_\Gamma(\Pi_i)/Z_\Gamma(F_i)$ is finite. Since Π_i meets the relative interior of F_i, the collection N_i of members of $\Sigma(C, L)|F_i$ containing Π_i must be finite. The group $N_\Gamma(\Pi_i)/Z_\Gamma(F_i)$ permutes N_i and this action is easily seen to be faithful. □

The following lemma will be needed in Section **??** and this seems to be the appropriate place to state it.

Lemma 3.9. *Let* Γ *be a subgroup of* $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ *which leaves* C *and some lattice in* $V(\mathbb{Q})$ *invariant. Then for every* $y \in C$*, the set of* $\xi \in C^\circ$ *with the property that* $\xi(y') > \xi(y)$ *for all* $y' \in \Gamma_y - \{y\}$ *is an open convex cone in* C° *(and hence nonempty).*

Proof. Since Γ acts properly discontinuously on C, Γy is discrete in C. For $\xi \in C^\circ$, $\xi|\bar{C}$ is proper and so $\xi(\Gamma y)$ is a discrete subset of $\mathbb{R}$. In particular, $\xi|\Gamma y$ has a minimum. So if U denotes the set of $\xi \in C^\circ$ with the property that $\xi|\Gamma y$ assumes its minimum in y, then U is a convex cone and we have $\Gamma \cdot U = C^\circ$. Since C° is a Baire space, the interior of U is nonempty. Let $U_0 \subset U$ denote the set of $\xi \in C^\circ$ with the property that $\xi|\Gamma y$ assumes its infimum in y only. Since $U - U_0$ consists of $\xi \in V^*$ which take the same value in y and in some other point of Γy, it is contained in a countable union of hyperplanes and so $U_0 \neq \emptyset$. It is clear that U_0 is convex. It remains to show that U_0 is open in C°.

Let $\xi_0 \in U_0$ and put $a := \xi_0(y)$ and $b := \inf(\xi_0|\Gamma y - \{y\})$. Since $\xi_0|\Gamma y$ is proper, the infimum is a minimum and we have $a < b$. Denote by K the intersection of $\bar{C}$ with the affine hyperplane defined by $\xi_0 = b$. This is a compact set (because $\xi_0|\bar{C}$ is proper) and so the set of $\xi \in C^\circ$ with $\min \xi|K > \xi(a)$ is open in C° and contains ξ_0. Since we have $\Gamma y - \{y\} \subset K + \bar{C}$, it is also contained in U_0. □

4. Polyhedral Pairs

In this section V continues to denote a real finite dimensional vector space equipped with a rational structure $V(\mathbb{Q}) \subset V$ and C is an open nondegenerate convex cone in V.

Proposition-Definition 4.1. *Let* Γ *be a subgroup of* $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ *which stabilizes* C *and some lattice in* $V(\mathbb{Q})$*. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists a polyhedral cone* Π *in* C_+ *with* $\Gamma \cdot \Pi = C_+$.
- (ii) *There exists a polyhedral cone* Π *in* C_+ *with* $\Gamma \cdot \Pi \supset C$.
- (iii) *For every* Γ*-invariant lattice* $L \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$, Γ *has finitely many orbits in the set of extreme points of* $[C \cap L]$.
- (iv) *For some* Γ*-invariant lattice* $L \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$, Γ *has finitely many orbits in the set of extreme points of* $[C \cap L]$.
- $(i)^*$-$(iv)^*$ *The corresponding property for the contragradient action of* Γ *on* C°.

Moreover, in case (ii) *we necessarily have* $\Gamma \cdot \Pi = C_+$*. If one of these equivalent conditions is fulfilled, we say that the pair* (C_+, Γ) *(or the triple* $(V(\mathbb{Q}), C, \Gamma)$*) is of* polyhedral type*.*

Proof. The implications $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ and $(iii) \Rightarrow (iv)$ are obvious.

We prove $(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$. Let Π be as in (ii). Without loss of generality we may assume that Π is rationally polyhedral. Denoting the set of extreme points of $[C \cap L]$ by E, then we must show that $E \cap \Pi$ is finite. Every extreme point of $[C \cap L]$ is in $C \cap L$ and hence $E \cap \Pi \subset C \cap L \cap \Pi$. By Gordan's lemma [5], p. 7, the semi-group $C \cap L \cap \Pi$ admits a finite set of generators, E_0, say. It is clear that we must have $E \cap \Pi \subset E_0$.

Proof of $(iv) \Rightarrow (i)^*$. In 3.5 we have defined a rationally polyhedral decomposition $\Sigma = \Sigma(C^\circ, L^*)$ of C°_+. This decomposition is Γ-invariant, and the correspondence $P \mapsto \sigma(P)$ between faces of $[C \cap L]$ and members of Σ is equivariant. Now extreme points of $[C \cap L]$ correspond to maximal members of Σ. So if E is a system of Γ-representatives in the collection of extreme points of $[C \cap L]$, then $\sum_{e \in E} \sigma(\{e\})$ is a rationally polyhedral cone in C_+° whose Γ-orbit equals C_+°.

These implications, together with their dual forms, prove the equivalence of (i) through $(iv)^*$. As for the last assertion, we choose a rationally polyhedral cone $\Pi_1 \subset C_+$ such that $\Gamma \cdot \Pi_1 = C_+$ (which exists in view of $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$) and prove that $\Gamma \cdot \Pi \supset \Pi_1$. By the Siegel property 3.8, the collection $\{\gamma(\Pi) \cap \Pi_1 | \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ has only finitely many distinct members, so $(\Gamma \cdot \Pi) \cap \Pi_1$ is closed. Since $\Gamma \cdot \Pi \supset C$ and the latter contains the interior of Π_1, it follows that $\Gamma \cdot \Pi \supset \Pi_1$. □

An important class of examples is singled out by the proposition below, which generalizes a theorem due to A. Ash [1].

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-algebraic subgroup of the general linear group of V without nontrivial $\mathbb{Q}$-characters. Assume that the identity component $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R})^0$ of the real point set of $\mathcal{G}$ leaves C invariant and is transitive on the projectivization $\mathbb{P}(C)$ of C. Then $\Gamma := \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R})^0 \cap \mathrm{GL}(L)$ is an arithmetic group in $\mathcal{G}$ and (C_+, Γ) is of polyhedral type.*

Proof. The rationally polyhedral decomposition $\Sigma(C, L)$ of C_+ is Γ-invariant, and in view of 4.1-iv^* we have to show that the collection of its maximal members breaks up in only finitely many Γ-equivalence classes. This amounts to proving the corresponding assertion for the induced decomposition $\mathbb{P}(\Sigma)$ of $\mathbb{P}(C)$. To this end, we note that $\mathbb{P}(C)$ has a canonical—and hence G-invariant—metric [1]. Almost by definition, Γ is an arithmetic subgroup of G. As $\mathcal{G}$ has no rational characters, a theorem of Borel [2] implies that $\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{P}(C)$ has finite volume. Hence the collection of maximal members of $\mathbb{P}(\Sigma)$ decomposes in a finite number of Γ-orbits. □

Remark 4.3. A theorem due to Vinberg [15] asserts that if $C \subset V$ is a homogeneous convex cone, then its group $\mathrm{Aut}(C)$ of automorphisms is algebraic. So if $\mathrm{Aut}(C)$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ relative some $\mathbb{Q}$-structure on V and all its $\mathbb{Q}$-characters induce scalar multiplication in V, then the above proposition applies to $\mathrm{Aut}(C) \cap \mathrm{SL}(V)$.

Example 4.4. Another interesting class of examples not contained in the one above arises in the theory of Coxeter groups. Let (n_{ij}) be a nonsingular, integral $l \times l$ generalized Cartan matrix [6] without components of finite type. Let $W \subset \mathrm{GL}_l(\mathbb{Z})$ be the (Weyl) group generated by the reflections $s_i : x \mapsto x - \sum_j n_{ij} x_j$ and let I denote the W-orbit of the *fundamental chamber* $\Pi \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ defined by $x_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, l\}$. It is known that I is nondegenerate convex [6], and so (I, W) is a pair of polyhedral type. The dual construction (for the contragradient action of W on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$) yields a nondegenerate convex cone $\check{I} \subset (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ which with W also forms a pair of polyhedral type. But its closure is *not* in general the dual of I.

Somewhat more general situations which have been investigated by Vinberg [13] also give examples of polyhedral pairs.

Example 4.5. Algebraic geometry can provide interesting and highly nontrivial examples of triples of polyhedral type. If X is a complex compact manifold, then take for V the realification of the Néron-Severi group of X, for C the cone in V spanned by the ample classes (we assume this set to be nonempty) and for Γ the image $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ in $\mathrm{GL}(V)$. It is known that (C, V, Γ) is a polyhedral triple for many surfaces, among them K3 surfaces (Sterk [12] and Enriques surfaces (Namikawa [10]). David Morrison's cone conjecture [9] asserts that this should also hold if X is Calabi-Yau with $h^{2,0}(X) = 0$. This, too has been verified in many cases.

Question 4.6. Given a pair of polyhedral type (C_+, Γ), do Γ and the cone generated by the Γ-orbit of a rational point of $C_+ - \{0\}$ form a pair of polyhedral type?

There is in general no subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{GL}(V(\mathbb{Q}))$ which forms with C_+ a pair of polyhedral type. But if there is one, then the next result says that all such subgroups belong to a single commensurability class. (Recall that two subgroups of some group are said to be *commensurable* if their intersection is of finite index in each of them, and that this is an equivalence relation.)

Proposition 4.7. *Let* (C_+, Γ) *be a pair of polyhedral type, and let* Γ' *be a subgroup of* $\mathrm{GL}(V(\mathbb{Q}))$ *which stabilizes* C. *Then* (C_+, Γ') *is of polyhedral type if and only if* Γ' *is commensurable with* Γ.

Proof. 'If': Let $L \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$ be a lattice stabilized by Γ. If Γ' contains Γ as a subgroup of finite index, then $\Gamma' \cdot L$ is contained in a finite union of lattices, and hence generates a lattice $L' \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$. Clearly, Γ' stabilizes L'. It then follows from the definition 4.1-i, that (C_+, Γ') is of polyhedral type. If on the other hand Γ' is a subgroup of finite index of Γ, then choose a finite system $S \subset \Gamma$ of representatives of left cosets of Γ' in Γ. If Π is a rationally polyhedral cone in C_+ such that $\Gamma \cdot \Pi = C_+$, then $\Pi' = \sum_{s \in S} s(\Pi)$ is a rationally polyhedral cone satisfying $\Gamma' \cdot \Pi' = C_+$, and so (C_+, Γ) is in this case of polyhedral type, too.

'Only if': Assume that (C_+, Γ) is of polyhedral type. If $L' \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$ is a lattice stabilized by Γ', then $L' \supset kL$, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and so $L \supset L' \cap L \supset kL$. Since L/kL is finite, the group of $\gamma \in \Gamma$ stabilizing $L' \cap L$ is of finite index in Γ, and hence forms with C_+ a polyhedral pair. A similar assertion holds for the group of $\gamma' \in \Gamma'$ which stabilize $L \cap L'$. So without loss of generality we can assume that Γ and Γ' both stabilize a lattice $L \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$. It is enough to prove that the group Γ'' of $\gamma \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ which leave both L and C invariant, contains Γ and Γ' as subgroups of finite index. Let Π be a rationally polyhedral cone in C_+ such that $\Gamma \cdot \Pi \supset C$, and let S denote the set of $\gamma'' \in \Gamma''$ with $\gamma''(\Pi) \cap \Pi \cap C \neq \emptyset$. By the Siegel property 3.8, S is finite. For every $\gamma'' \in \Gamma''$ there exists a $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\gamma(\Pi)$ meets $\gamma''(\Pi) \cap C$, so that $\gamma^{-1}\gamma'' \in S$.

This proves that $\Gamma'' = S\cdot\Gamma$ and hence that Γ is of finite index in Γ''. For the same reason, Γ' is of finite index in Γ''. $\square$

In the remainder of this section, (C_+,Γ) is of polyhedral type and $L\subset V(\mathbb{Q})$ is a Γ-invariant lattice.

Proposition 4.8. *Let Σ be a Γ-invariant locally rationally polyhedral decomposition of C_+, and let $\sigma\in\Sigma$. Then $(\sigma,\Gamma(\sigma))$ is of polyhedral type, and if F denotes the smallest face of C_+ which contains σ, then the collection* $\mathrm{Star}(\sigma) := \{\tau\in\Sigma|\tau\supseteq\sigma\}$ *decomposes into a finite number of $Z_\Gamma(F)$-equivalence classes.*

Proof. Let Π be a rationally polyhedral cone in C_+ with $\Gamma\cdot\Pi = C_+$. Then Π meets the relative interiors of only finitely many members of Σ. Let $\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_N\in\Gamma$ be such that $\gamma_1(\dot\sigma),\dots,\gamma_N(\dot\sigma)$ are the Γ-translates of $\dot\sigma$ which meet Π. Then $\Pi_1 := (\gamma_1^{-1}(\Pi)+\cdots+\gamma_N^{-1}(\Pi))\cap\sigma$ is a rationally polyhedral cone. For every $x\in\dot\sigma$, there exists a $\gamma\in\Gamma$ such that $\gamma(x)\in\Pi$. Then $\gamma(\dot\sigma)\cap\Pi\neq\emptyset$ and so $\gamma(\dot\sigma)=\gamma_\nu(\dot\sigma)$ for some $\nu\in\{1,\dots,N\}$. This implies that $\gamma_\nu^{-1}\gamma$ leaves σ invariant and maps x into Π_1. So $\Gamma(\sigma)\cdot\Pi_1\supset\dot\sigma$. As every rationally polyhedral cone in C_+ intersects σ in a rationally polyhedral cone, we have $(\dot\sigma)_+=\sigma$. This proves the first assertion.

Next we fix a $x_0\in\dot\sigma\cap V(\mathbb{Q})$ which is not a fixed point of a nonidentity element of $\Gamma(\sigma)$. We prove that for every $\tau\in\Sigma$ with $\tau\supset\sigma$, there exists a $\gamma_\tau\in\Gamma$ such that $\gamma_\tau(x_0)\in\Pi$ and $\gamma_\tau(\dot\tau)\cap\Pi\neq\emptyset$. This will imply the last assertion, for $\Gamma x_0\cap\Pi$ and $\Sigma|\Pi$ are finite. To see that such a γ_τ exists, choose a rationally polyhedral cone $\Pi_\tau\subset\tau$ with $\Pi_\tau\cap\dot\tau\neq\emptyset$ and $\Pi_\tau\cap\sigma=\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}x_0$. Since $\{\Pi_\tau\cap\gamma^{-1}(\Pi)|\gamma\in\Gamma\}$ is a finite collection of rationally polyhedral cones which covers Π_τ, there exists a $\gamma_\tau\in\Gamma$ with $x_0\in\gamma_\tau^{-1}(\Pi)$ and $\dot\Pi_\tau\cap\gamma_\tau^{-1}(\Pi)\neq\emptyset$. So $\gamma_\tau(x_0)\in\Pi$ and $\gamma_\tau(\dot\tau)\cap\Pi\neq\emptyset$, as required. $\square$

Example 4.9. Here is an example of a nontrivial situation where the previous proposition applies. Let $\langle\,,\,\rangle$ be a symmetric bilinear form on V of signature $(1,\dim V-1)$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, and let C be a connected component of the set of $x\in V$ with $\langle x,x\rangle>0$. We choose a lattice L in $V(\mathbb{Q})$, and let $\Gamma := O(L)\cap\mathrm{Aut}(C)$. It follows from Proposition 4.2 that $(V(\mathbb{Q}),C,\Gamma)$ is of polyhedral type. Suppose now further be given a collection $\mathcal{H}$ of hyperplanes of V defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ meeting C, which is a finite union of Γ-equivalence classes.

Claim. The collection of hyperplanes $\mathcal{H}$ induces a Γ-invariant locally rationally polyhedral decomposition Σ of C_+.

Proof. We must show that for every rationally polyhedral cone Π in C_+, the collection $\{H\cap\Pi|H\in\mathcal{H}\}$ has only finitely distict members. Given $H\in\mathcal{H}$, then $C_+\cap H$ and the group of $\gamma\in O(L\cap H)$ which preserve $C\cap H$ make up a pair of polyhedral type (of one dimension lower, but otherwise of the same type as (C_+,Γ)). It is not hard to show that $\Gamma(H)$ is of finite index in the latter group, and so by 4.7, $(C_+\cap H,\Gamma(H))$ is also of polyhedral type. Hence there exists a rationally polyhedral cone $\Pi_H \subset C_+ \cap H$ such that $\Gamma(H) \cdot \Pi_H = C_+ \cap H$. By the Siegel property 3.8, the collection $\{\gamma(\Pi_H) \cap \Pi | \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ has finitely many distinct members. If we let H run over a representative system of Γ-equivalence classes in $\mathcal{H}$, we find that the same is true for the collection $\{H \cap \Pi | H \in \mathcal{H}\}$. □

This construction often yields locally rationally polyhedral decompositions of C_+ for which the adjective 'locally' can not be dropped, and thus produces in view of 4.8 also interesting new examples of pairs of polyhedral type. For instance, given a union T of conjugacy classes of reflections in Γ, then because such conjugacy classes are finite in number, the collection $\mathcal{H}$ of fixed point hyperplanes of the members of T breaks up in a finite number of Γ-equivalence classes. The resulting locally rationally polyhedral decomposition of C_+ is rationally polyhedral if and only if the subgroup of Γ generated by T is of finite index in Γ. This follows from work of Vinberg [13]. But according to this very author [14], in only a few cases the subgroup of Γ generated by its reflections is of finite index in Γ.

Proposition 4.10. *Every Γ-invariant kernel for C contains a core and is contained in a cocore for C. Moreover $[(\bar{C} - \{0\}) \cap L] + \bar{C}$ is a cocore for C, and dually, $((C^* - \{0\}) \cap L^*)^\vee$ is a core for C.*

Proof. Choose a rationally polyhedral cone $\Pi \subset C_+$ such that $\Gamma \cdot \Pi = C_+$. Let K be a Γ-invariant kernel for C. Since $\Pi \cap (C^\circ \cap L^*)^\vee$ contains the convex hull of $(\Pi - \{0\}) \cap L$ and $0 \notin \bar{K} \cap \Pi$, there exists a $\lambda > 0$ such that $\bar{K} \cap \Pi \subset \lambda(C^\circ \cap L^*)^\vee$. This implies that the last set also contains $\bar{K} \cap C$. As $\bar{K} \cap C$ is dense in $\bar{K}$, it follows that it even contains $\bar{K}$. Applying this to $K^\vee$, we also find that $\bar{K} = K^{\vee\vee}$ contains a set of the form $\mu[C \cap L]$ for some $\mu > 0$. Hence K contains $2\mu[C \cap L]$.

Let Λ denote the set of lattice points in $\bar{C} - \{0\}$. Clearly, $(C^\circ \cap L^*)^\vee$ contains Λ and hence also $[\Lambda] + \bar{C}$. If $\nu > 0$ is such that $\Pi \cap (C^\circ \cap L^*)\vee \subset \nu[(\Pi - \{0\}) \cap L]$, then $C \cap (C^\circ \cap L^*)^\vee \subset \nu[\Lambda]$. Following (...), $[\Lambda] + \bar{C}$ is closed, and since $C \cap (C^\circ \cap L^*)^\vee$ is dense in $(C^\circ \cap L^*)^\vee$, it follows that the last space is contained in $\nu[\Lambda] + \bar{C}$. This proves that $[\Lambda] + \bar{C}$ is a cocore for C. If we apply this to the dual situation and dualize, we find that $((C^* - \{0\}) \cap L^*)^\vee$ is a core for C. □

Remark 4.11. It is in general not true that a cocore is contained in C_+. To see this, suppose that there exist a face $F \neq \{0\}$ of C_+, and a proper face G of $\bar{C}$ which contains F and whose relative interior does not contain any rational point. Then no cocore is contained in C_+: if $L \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$ is a lattice, choose $p \in \dot{F} \cap L$, so that p belongs to the typical cocore $K := (C^\circ \cap L^*)^\vee$. Hence $K \supset p + \bar{C} \supset p + \dot{G}$, and the last space is a nonempty open subset of $\dot{G}$ which by assumption does not meet C_+.

To be more concrete, let V be the space of symmetric bilinear forms on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$ with its standard rational structure, and let C be the cone of positive definite forms. (We are in a special case of 4.2 if we take $\mathcal{G} := \mathrm{PSL}_n$).)

Choose an irrational line l in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and let F resp. G be the cone of positive semi-definite forms on $\mathbb{R}^n$ whose nilspace contains $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ resp. l. Then F is the half line spanned by x_n^2 and is a face of C_+, whereas G is a face of $\bar{C}$ which contains F, but has no rational points in its relative interior.

The following assertion generalizes the recapitulating Proposition 11 on page 142 of [1].

Proposition 4.12. *Let* K *be a* Γ*-invariant kernel for* C*. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) K *is locally rationally polyhedral.*
- (ii) *There exists a finite nonempty union* S *of* Γ*-orbits in* $(\bar{C}-\{0\})\cap V(\mathbb{Q})$ *such that* $K = [S] + \bar{C}$*.*
- $(i)^*$ $K^\vee$ *is locally rationally polyhedral.*
- $(ii)^*$ *There exists a finite nonempty union* S^* *of* Γ*-orbits in* $(C^* - \{0\}) \cap V(\mathbb{Q})$ *such that* $K^\vee = [S^*] + C^*$*.*

Moreover, if one of these conditions is fulfilled, then K *is closed and every bounded face of* K *is a rational polyhedron.*

Proof. $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ plus the last clause: Let $\Pi \subset C_+$ be a rationally polyhedral cone such that $\Gamma \cdot \Pi = C_+$. Since $K \cap \Pi$ is a rational polyhedron, the set S_0 of its extreme points is a finite set of rational points with the property that $K\cap\Pi = ([S_0]+\bar{C})\cap\Pi$. So if we let $S := \Gamma\cdot S_0$, then K contains $[S]+\bar{C}$ and both sets have the same intersection with Π. It follows that $K\cap C_+ = [S]+\bar{C}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $S_0 \subset \frac{1}{k}L$. Then $S \subset \frac{1}{k}L$, which shows that S is discrete in V. According to Lemma 1.6, this implies that $[S] + \bar{C}$ is closed in V. As $K \cap C_+$ is dense in K, it follows that $K = [S] + \bar{C}$.

If P is a bounded face of K, then every extreme point of P is an extreme point of K, and hence belongs to $\frac{1}{k}L$. It follows that P is a rational polyhedron.

$(ii) \Rightarrow (i)^*$: As above we deduce that S is contained in some lattice in $V(\mathbb{Q})$. We then conclude from Lemma 3.7 that $([S] + \bar{C})^\vee = S^\vee \cap C^*$ is locally rationally polyhedral in C_+.

The proposition now follows from the proven implications and their dual versions. $\square$

Definition 4.13. We call a function $f : C_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ *admissible* if f is continuous and for every rationally polyhedral cone $\Pi \subset C_+$, the set of $(x,t) \in \Pi \times \mathbb{R}$ with $f(x) \geq t$ is a rationally polyhedral cone. So

$$C_f := \{(x,t) \in C_+ \times \mathbb{R} | f(x) > t\}$$

is an open nondegerate convex cone in $V \times \mathbb{R}$ with $C_{f,+} = \{(x,t) \in C_+ \times \mathbb{R} | f(x) \geq t\}$. The interest of such a function lies in the fact that it determines a decomposition $\Sigma(f)$ of C_+: the members of this decomposition are simply the projections of the faces of C_f which do not contain the negative t-axis.

An alternative characterization of $\Sigma(f)$ is that it is the coarsest locally rationally polyhedral decomposition of C_+ with the property that f is linear on each member.

Let us return to Example 4.9. We prove that the decomposition described there comes from an admissible function. Fix a maximal member $\sigma \in \Sigma$, and let for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$, ξ_H be the unique indivisible element of L^*, which defines H and is ≥ 0 on σ. For $x \in C_+$, we define

$$f(x) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \min\{\xi_H(x), 0\}.$$

The sum involves at most a finite number of nonzero terms, since at most finitely many $H \in \mathcal{H}$ will separate x from σ. It is easily verified that f is admissible and that $\Sigma(f) = \Sigma$. Notice that f transforms under $\gamma \in \Gamma$ as follows: $f\gamma^{-1} = f + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}(\gamma)} \xi_H$, where $\mathcal{H}(\gamma)$ denotes the collection of $H \in \mathcal{H}$ which separate $\gamma^{-1}(\sigma)$ from σ. So f is not Γ-invariant (unless $\mathcal{H} = \emptyset$), but $\gamma \mapsto f\gamma^{-1} - f$ is a 1-cocycle on Γ with values in the Γ-representation $V(\mathbb{Q})^*$.

Interesting examples of Γ-invariant admissible functions (and hence of Γ-invariant locally rationally polyhedral decompositions) are obtained from Γ-invariant locally rationally polyhedral kernels:

Lemma 4.14. *Let K be a Γ-invariant locally rationally polyhedral kernel for C°. Then every $x \in C_+$ has a minimum on K, and if we denote this minimum by $f_K(x)$, then f_K is a Γ-invariant admissible function on C_+ and $K^\vee \cap C_+ = \{x \in C_+ | f_K(x) \geq 1\}$.*

Proof. Let E denote the set of extreme points of K. Since $K = [E + C^*]$, it follows that for $x \in C_+$, $\inf_K x = \inf_E x$. Write $x = \lambda_1 x_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m x_m$ with x_μ a rational point of C_+ and $\lambda_\mu \geq 0$. Since E is contained in a lattice in $V(\mathbb{Q})^*$, $x_\mu(E)$ will be a discrete subset of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\mu = 1, \dots, m$. Hence the same is true for $x(E)$. In particular, $x(E)$ has a minimum.

Now let Π be a rationally polyhedral cone in C_+ Then $\Pi \cap K^\vee$ is a rational polyhedron (which may be empty). Let $\phi : \Pi \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the function characterized by $\phi(\lambda x) = \lambda\phi(x)$, $x \in \Pi, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and $\{x \in \Pi | \phi(x) \geq 1\} = \Pi \cap K^\vee$. Then the set of $(x, t) \in \Pi \times \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi(x) \geq t$ is a rationally polyhedral cone, and it is clear that $\phi = f_K | \Pi$. So f_K is admissible and $K^\vee \cap C_+ = \{x \in C_+ | f_K(x) \geq 1\}$. □

Let us now consider the special case when K is a Γ-invariant locally rationally polyhedral core for C°. Then $K^\vee$ is a Γ-invariant locally rationally polyhedral cocore for C and hence the cone spanned by the union of the bounded faces of $K^\vee$ coincides with C_+. According to Proposition 4.12 every bounded face of $K^\vee$ is a rational polyhedron, so that $\Sigma(K) := \Sigma(f_{K^\vee})$ is in fact a rationally polyhedral decomposition of C_+. Moreover, the nonempty faces of K parameterize in a bijective manner the nonempty faces of $\Sigma(f_{K^\vee})$ by assigning to a face P of K the cone $\sigma(P)$ of $x \in V$ with the property that $x|K$ assumes its infimum on all of P. In particular, $C_+ = \cup\sigma(P)$ is the set of

$x \in V$ which have a minimum on K. Notice that $P \mapsto \sigma(P)$ reverses inclusions and that $\dim P + \dim \sigma(P) = \dim V$. This generalizes the construction of $\Sigma(C, L)$ of 3.5, for the latter is obtained if we take $K = [C^\circ \cap L^*]$.

Application 4.15 (Construction of a polyhedral Γ-fundamental domain in C_+)**.** Choose $\xi \in C^\circ \cap V^*(\mathbb{Q})$. Then it follows from Proposition 4.12 that $K = [\Gamma\xi] + C^*$ is a Γ-invariant locally rationally polyhedral kernel. If $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $\lambda\xi \in L^*$, then $\lambda K \subset [C^\circ \cap L^*]$ and so by Proposition 4.10 K is a core for C°. Every extreme point of K corresponds to a maximal element of $\Sigma(K)$. Since $\Gamma\xi$ is the set of extreme points of K, it follows that Γ is transitive on the collection of maximal members of $\Sigma(K)$. So

$$\sigma := \sigma(\{\xi\}) = \{x \in C_+ \mid \xi(\gamma x) \geq \xi(x) \text{ for all } \gamma \in \Gamma\}$$

is a rationally polyhedral cone with the property that $\Gamma \cdot \sigma = C_+$ and $\gamma(\sigma) \cap \dot{\sigma} \neq \emptyset$ if $\gamma \in \Gamma$ does not fix ξ. In particular, σ is a fundamental domain in C_+ if $\Gamma_\xi = \{1\}$. It also follows that C_+ is just the set of $x \in \bar{C}$ which have a minimum on Γx.

If we take $\xi \in \dot{F} \cap V^*(\mathbb{Q})$, where F is a proper face of $C^\circ_+ - \{0\}$, then the corresponding decomposition $\Sigma(K)$ is also of interest. Again, Γ is then transitive on the maximal members of $\Sigma(K)$, and the stabilizer of $\sigma(\{\xi\})$ (which is one such member) is Γ_ξ. Notice that Γ_ξ contains $Z_\Gamma(F)$ as a subgroup of finite index; in general this will be an infinite group.

We finally mention two consequences of having a polyhedral fundamental domain.

Corollary 4.16. *The group Γ is finitely presented.*

Proof. Let Π be a rationally polyhedral cone in C_+ such that $\Gamma \cdot \Pi = C_+$. So $\Gamma \cdot (\Pi \cap C) = C$. As is well-known (and easy to prove), the mere fact that C_+ is connected now implies that Γ is generated by the $\gamma \in \Gamma$ for which $\gamma(\Pi) \cap \Pi$ is a codimension one face of Π. This is clearly a finite set. Similarly, the fact that C_+ is simply connected implies that a complete set of relations among these generators is indexed by the codimension two faces of Π. ☐

The other consequence is that Γ is also *of type VFL of dimension* (see below). This is based on a standard construction, which we briefly recall.

Consider the Γ-invariant decomposition Σ of C_+ constructed from the Γ-stable lattice $L \subset V(\mathbb{Q})$ in 4.15. It has a canonical "barycentric" subdivision defined as follows: every member $\sigma \in \Sigma$, being a rational polyhedral cone, has finitely many extremal rays. Every such ray meets L in a half group and so has a canonical generator. The sum of these generators spans a ray R_σ with $\dot{R}_\sigma \subset \dot{\sigma}$. Now Σ is naturally refined by a decomposition Σ' whose members $\neq \{0\}$ are indexed by the strictly monotonous sequences $\sigma_\bullet := (\sigma_0 \supsetneq \sigma_1 \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq \sigma_k \neq 0)$ in Σ, the associated polyhedral cone being $\langle\sigma_\bullet\rangle := R_{\sigma_0} + \cdots + R_{\sigma_k}$. Notice that if σ_k meets C, then $\langle\sigma_\bullet\rangle \subset C \cup \{0\}$ so that $P(\langle\sigma\rangle)$ is a polyhedron entirely contained in the open contractible $P(C) \subset P(V)$. Let us denote by $S_\Sigma \subset P(\Sigma)$ the the union of such polyhedra (often called the *spine* of $P(\Sigma)$). This is clearly invariant under Γ and a finite union of these form a fundamental domain for the Γ-action in S_Σ. The decomposition of $P(\Sigma)$ gives the latter also the structure of a CW-complex of dimension $\leq \dim V - 1$.

If $\sigma_\bullet = (\sigma_0 \supsetneq \sigma_1 \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq \sigma_k \neq 0)$ is any strictly monotonous sequence in Σ not ending with $\{0\}$ with $\sigma_0 \cap C \neq \emptyset$, then let $r \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ be the highest index for which σ_r still meets C and denote by $\sigma_\bullet^C$ the truncation $\sigma_0 \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq \sigma_r$. There is a natural deformation retraction of the improper $P(\langle\sigma_\bullet\rangle) \cap P(C)$ onto spinal polyhedron $P(\langle\sigma_\bullet^C\rangle)$. It is compatible with inclusion and so this results in a Γ-equivariant deformation retraction of $P(C)$ onto the spine S_Σ. In particular, S_Σ is contractible.

Corollary 4.17. *The group Γ is* of type VFL of dimension $\leq \dim V - 1$ *(which means that that there exists a subgroup $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ of finite index such that the trivial Γ'-module $\mathbb{Z}$ admits a resolution of length $\leq \dim V - 1$ by free finite rank $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma']$-modules).*

Proof. Let (for the moment) Γ' be the kernel of the representation of Γ on $L/3L$. According to well-known theorem of Serre, Γ' is torsion free. So Γ' acts freely on $P(C)$ and hence also on S_Σ. Upon replacing Γ' by a smaller subgroup (still of finite index in Γ) we may assume that the Γ'-stabilizer of any $\sigma \in \Sigma$ which meets C is trivial. The result is that the cells of S_Σ have the same property. The associated chain complex therefore provides a resolution of of length $\leq \dim V - 1$ of the trivial Γ'-module $\mathbb{Z}$ by free finite rank $\mathbb{Z}[\Gamma']$-modules. □

This implies among other things that the cohomology of Γ with values in a finite dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space that is also a representation of Γ is finite dimensional. A case of particular interest is $H^1(\Gamma, V)$ (which has a $\mathbb{Q}$-structure for which $H^1(\Gamma, V)(\mathbb{Q}) = H^1(\Gamma, V(\mathbb{Q})))$. Any $c \in H^1(\Gamma, V)$ is representable by a cocycle, i.e., a map $\gamma \in \Gamma \mapsto c_\gamma \in V$ satisfying $c_{\gamma_1\gamma_2} = c_{\gamma_1} + \gamma_1(c_{\gamma_2})$. This defines an action of Γ on a copy V_c of V by affine-linear transformations defined by the rule $\gamma_c(v) := c_\gamma + \gamma(v)$ (so its linear part is the given action). The Γ-action on V_c has fixed point if and only if the class c is zero. We can make it depend linearly on c by choosing representative cocyles for a basis of $H^1(\Gamma, V)$ and then extending linearly the resulting actions. This yields an exact sequence of Γ-representations

$$0 \to V \to \tilde{V} \to H^1(\Gamma, V) \to 0,$$

where Γ acts of course trivially on $H^1(\Gamma, V)$. It is universal for that property (in a sense we don't bother to make precise). Let us be careful to choose the basis in $H^1(\Gamma, V)(\mathbb{Q})$ and the representative cocycles take their values in $V(\mathbb{Q})$. Then $\tilde{V}$ acquires a $\mathbb{Q}$-structure preserved by Γ. We can even do better and take the basis in the image of $H^1(\Gamma, L) \to H^1(G, V)$ and let the representative cocycles take their values in L. This defines a lattice $\tilde{L}$ in $\tilde{V}(\mathbb{Q})$ preserved by Γ.

Let us say that an element $v \in \tilde{V}$ is *admissible* relative to (C, Γ) if the convex hull the Γ-orbit of v has a recession cone contained in the closure of C. Notice that the admissible vectors make up a convex cone. This cone clearly contains the closure of C

Question 4.18. Does the cone in $\tilde{V}$ of admissible vectors have a nonempty interior?

5. The Stabilizer of a Face

Throughout this section, we fix a triple $(V(\mathbb{Q}), C, \Gamma)$ of polyhedral type (in the sense of Proposition 4.1) and a face F of C_+. Our principal goal is to describe the structure of the Γ-stabilizer of F.

We begin with a bit of notation. We let $F^\dagger$ stand for the set of $\xi \in C_+^0$ which vanish on F. This is clearly an exposed face of C_+^0 and its annihilator contains F. (We shall find that $F^{\dagger\dagger} = F$, but at this point it is not even clear whether $F \neq C_+$ implies $F^\dagger \neq \{0\}$.) We denote the linear span of F in V by V_F and write V^F for the annihilator of $F^\dagger$ (we shall later find that there is no conflict with that same notatation used in Section 1). So we have a flag of $\mathbb{Q}$ vector spaces defined over $\mathbb{Q}$:

$$0 \subset V_F \subset V^F \subset V.$$

We further put $T_F := V^F/V_F$ and denote the projections

$$\pi_F : V \to V/V_F, \quad \pi^F : V \to V/V^F,$$

so that the latter is the composite of π_F and a projection

$$q_F : V/V_F \to V/V^F.$$

Observe that we have a perfect duality $V/V^F \times V^*_{F^\dagger} \to \mathbb{R}$ and that under this duality $\pi^F(C)$ is identified with the open dual of $F^\dagger$. It is in particular a nondegenerate convex cone. Let us begin with stating one of the main results of this section. Denote by $N_\Gamma(F)$ the Γ-stabilizer of F. It acts on F and $F^\dagger$ and so we have a group homomorphism $N_\Gamma(F) \to \Gamma(F) \times \Gamma(F^\dagger)$.

Theorem 5.1. *The image of the projection* $N_\Gamma(F) \to \Gamma(F) \times \Gamma(F^\dagger)$ *is of finite index in the latter and the elements in its kernel that act trivially on* T_F *form a free abelian subgroup* $U_\Gamma(F)$ *of finite index in that kernel. The action of* $U_\Gamma(F)$ *on* V *is 2-step unipotent and is given by a unique homomorphism*

$$u \in U_\Gamma(F) \mapsto \sigma_u \in \mathrm{Hom}(V/V_F, V^F)$$

with the following properties:

(i) σ_u *maps* T_F *to* V_F *and the induced maps*

$$j_u : V/V^F \to T_F \text{ resp. } k_u : T_F \to V_F$$

are such that $u(x) = x + \sigma_u(x') + \frac{1}{2} k_u j_u(x'')$, *where* x' *resp.* x'' *denote the images of* x *in* V/V_F *resp.* V/V^F,

(ii) *for* $u, v \in U_\Gamma(F)$, *we have* $k_u j_v = k_v j_u$,

(iii) $k_u j_u$ *maps* $\pi^F(C)$ *to* $F-\{0\}$, *unless* $u=1$.

Example 5.2. This theorem is well illustrated by the following basic example. We take for V the space $\mathrm{Sym}^2 W$ of symmetric tensors in $W\otimes W$, where W is a real finite dimensional vector space with a $\mathbb{Q}$-structure, and for $C\subset V$ the cone of positive ones. Then C_+ is the span of the the pure squares $w\otimes w$ with $w\in W(\mathbb{Q})$. Alternatively, C_+ consists of the semipositive symmetric tensors whose annihilator is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. So a face F of C_+ is given by a subspace $K\subset W$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ and its relative interior consists of the positive elements in $\mathrm{Sym}^2 K$. We have $V_F=\mathrm{Sym}^2 K$, $V^F=K\circ W$ (the span of the tensors $k\otimes w+w\otimes k$, with $k\in K$), so that $T_F=V^F/V_F$ may be identified with $(W/K)\otimes K$ and V/V^F with $\mathrm{Sym}^2(W/K)$. The open dual C° is the cone of positive definite quadratic forms on W and under this identification, the relative interior $F^\dagger$ may be identified with the cone of positive definite quadratic forms on W/K. The group $\mathrm{GL}(W)$ acts on (V,C) and the stabilizer of F is the stabilizer of K. The latter maps onto $\mathrm{GL}(K)\times\mathrm{GL}(W/K)$ (its Levi quotient) with kernel an abelian unipotent group $U(F)$ that can be identified with the vector group $\mathrm{Hom}(W/K,K)$. The map $\sigma: U(F)\to\mathrm{Hom}(V/V_F,V^F)$ is identified with the map

$$\mathrm{Hom}(W/K,K)\to\mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Sym}^2 W/\mathrm{Sym}^2 K, K\circ W),$$

which assigns to $u\in\mathrm{Hom}(W/K,K)$ the map $\mathrm{Sym}^2(W/K)\to K\circ W$ characterized by $w\otimes w+\mathrm{Sym}^2 K\mapsto u(\bar w)\otimes w+w\otimes u(\bar w)$ (here $w\in W$ and $\bar w$ is its image in W/K). Notice that this induces maps

$$\begin{aligned} j_u:\mathrm{Sym}^2(W/K)&\to(W/K)\otimes K, &\bar w\otimes\bar w&\mapsto\bar w\otimes u(\bar w)\\ k_u:(W/K)\otimes K&\to\mathrm{Sym}^2 K, &\bar w\otimes k&\mapsto u(\bar w)\otimes k+k\otimes u(\bar w). \end{aligned}$$

so that $k_u j_v=u\otimes v+v\otimes u:\mathrm{Sym}^2(W/K)\to\mathrm{Sym}^2 K$. We note that if $(w_i)_i$ is a basis of W, then $\frac{1}{2}k_u j_u=u\otimes u$ sends $\sum_i w_i\otimes w_i$ to $\sum_i u(w_i)\otimes u(w_i)$, which is zero only when $u=0$.

If $\Gamma\subset\mathrm{SL}(W)$ is arithmetic, then we have a similar description for Γ-stabilizer of F (which is the Γ-stabilizer of K).

We shall denote the kernel of $N_\Gamma(F)\to G(F)\times\Gamma(F^\dagger)$ by $Z_\Gamma(F,F^\dagger)$ (so this is just $Z_\Gamma(F)\cap Z_\Gamma(F^\dagger)$; recall that we agreed that $Z_\Gamma(\ )$ assigns to a subset of a set with Γ-action the subgroup of $\gamma\in\Gamma$ that leave that subset pointwise fixed). Furthermore, L stands for some Γ-invariant lattice in $V(\mathbb{Q})$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let* Σ *be a* Γ*-invariant locally rationally polyhedral decomposition of* C_+*, and let* $\sigma\in\Sigma$ *be such that* $\dot\sigma$ *is open in* F*. Then*

(i) *every element of* $\pi_F(C_+)$ *is in the* π_F*-image of the relative interior of a unique member of* $\mathrm{Star}_\Sigma(\sigma)$*, and the projection* π_F *maps the members of* $\mathrm{Star}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ *onto a locally rationally polyhedral decomposition* $\pi_{F*}\mathrm{Star}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ *of* $\pi_F(C_+)$*,*

If Σ *is in fact rationally polyhedral, then:*

(ii) *if* P *is a rationally polyhedral cone in* $\pi^F(C_+)$ *whose preimage in* $\pi_F(C_+)$ *is denoted* $\tilde{P}$, *then the restriction of* $\pi^\dagger_{F*}\operatorname{Star}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ *to* $\tilde{P}$ *has only finitely many* $Z_\Gamma(F,F^\dagger)$*-orbits.*

Proof. Given $x \in C_+$, choose a rationally polyhedral cone Π in C_+ which intersects $\dot\sigma$ and contains x. Since $\Sigma|\Pi$ is a finite decomposition into rationally polyhedral cones, there is a $y \in \Pi \cap \dot\sigma$ such that $x+y$ is in the relative interior of a member of $\operatorname{Star}_\Sigma(\sigma)$. This member is clearly independent of the choice of y. Part (i) of the lemma now follows easily.

For (ii) we may assume that $\dot P \subset \pi^F(C)$. It suffices to show that the collection of $\tau \in \operatorname{Star}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ whose image in $\pi^F(C_+)$ meets $\tilde P$ is finite modulo $Z_\Gamma(F,F^\dagger)$. But this follows from the fact that the collection $\operatorname{Star}_\Sigma(\sigma)$ is finite modulo $Z_\Gamma(F)$ by Proposition 4.8 and the Siegel property of the image of the latter group in $\pi^F(C)_+$. □

Corollary 5.4. *The projection* π^F *maps* C_+ *onto* $\pi^F(C)_+$ *and the image of* $Z_\Gamma(F)$ *in* $\Gamma(F^\dagger)$ *is a subgroup of the latter of finite index (or equivalently, the image of* $N_\Gamma(F)$ *in* $\Gamma(F)\times\Gamma(F^\dagger)$ *is a subgroup of finite index).*

Proof. Choose a Γ-invariant rationally polyhedral decomposition Σ. It follows from Proposition 4.8 that there exists a rational polyhedral cone Π in C_+ whose $Z_\Gamma(F)$-orbit contains $|\operatorname{Star}_\Sigma(\sigma)|$. Then (i) of Lemma 5.3 implies that $Z_\Gamma(F)\cdot\pi^F(\Pi) = \pi^F(C_+)$. The corollary now follows from 4.1. □

Remark 5.5. In contrast to first assertion of the above Corollary, it may happen that $\pi_F(C)_+$ is strictly greater than $\pi_F(C_+)$.

Proposition 5.6. *Let* G *be a face of* C_+ *which contains* F.

(i) *The common zero set of the set of rational linear forms on* V_G *which are* ≥ 0 *on* G *and vanish on* F *is* $V^F \cap V_G$.

(ii) *The assignment* $F \mapsto F^\dagger$ *sets up bijection between the faces of* C_+ *and those of* C_+° *which reverses the inclusion relation. In particular,* $F^{\dagger\dagger} = F$ *and* F *is an exposed face of* C_+.

(iii) *The projections* π_F *resp.* π^F *map* G *onto a face of* $\pi_F(C_+)$ *resp.* $\pi^F(C_+)$ *respectively; this sets up a bijection between the collection of faces of* C_+ *which contain* F, *the collection of faces of* $\pi_F(C_+)$, *and the collection of faces of* $\pi^F(C_+)$.

(iv) *The dual of* $\pi^F(\dot G)$ *is naturally identified with the closure of* $\pi^\dagger_{G^\dagger}(F^\dagger)$.

Proof. We first prove (i) under the additional hypothesis that $G = G^{\dagger\dagger}$. (This assumption becomes superfluous once we have proved (ii).) We have to show that every rational linear form ξ on V_G which is ≥ 0 on F extends to a rational linear form on V which is ≥ 0 on C. Since $G = G^{\dagger\dagger}$, this follows from Corollary 5.4 applied to $G^\dagger$: such ξ a lies in the image of C_+°) under π^G.

We next prove a special case of (ii): We claim that if $F^\dagger = \{0\}$, then $F = C_+$. Choose $x \in \dot F \cap L$. Then for every nonzero integral $\xi \in C^*$ we have

$\xi(x) \geq 1$ (otherwise $F^\dagger \neq \{0\}$) and hence $x \in [(C^* - \{0\}) \cap L^*]^\vee$. According to Proposition 4.10 the last set is a core for C and hence contained in C. So $x \in C$ and hence $F = C_+$.

Now we prove (ii) in general. Clearly, $F^{\dagger\dagger} = V^F \cap C_+ \supset F$. We may apply the above to $G := F^{\dagger\dagger}$ and find that there is no rational linear form on V_G which is ≥ 0 on G and zero on F. Then $F = G$ by the special case.

(iii) Let H' denote the face of $\pi^F(C_+)$ whose relative interior contains $\pi^F(G)$. Then the pre-image of H' under $\pi^F|C_+$ is a face of C_+ whose relative interior intersects $(V_G + V^F) \cap C_+$, and hence $V^G \cap C_+$. This last set is equal to G (by (ii)), and so $H = G$ and $H' = \pi^F(G)$. The assertion follows from this.

(iv) By (ii), $\pi^{G^\dagger}(C^\circ)$ can be regarded as the open dual of $\dot{G}$. Then applying (ii) once more to the face F of G shows that $\pi^F(\dot{G})$ can be identified with the open dual of $\pi^{G^\dagger}(C^\circ_+) \cap \mathrm{Ann}(F)$. By (iii), this last set is just $\pi^{G^\dagger}(F^\dagger)$. □

Corollary 5.7. *Every rational linear form on the linear span of* F *which is* ≥ 0 *on* F *extends to a rational linear form on* V *which is* ≥ 0 *on* C*.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that $\pi^\dagger_{F^\dagger}$ maps C°_+ onto $(\pi^{F^\dagger} C^\circ)_+$ (by Corollary 5.4 and the fact that $\pi^{F^\dagger} C^\circ$ can be identified with the open dual of $\dot{F}$ (by Proposition 5.6-iii). □

We shall need the following proposition.

Proposition 5.8. *Let be given a real affine space* A *of finite dimension, an affine lattice* $L \subset A$*, an open convex subset* D *of* A *and a group* Δ *of affine-linear transformations of* A *which leave both* L *and* D *invariant. If* Δ *has only a finite number of orbits in* $L \cap D$*, then the asymptotic space* $\mathrm{As}(D)$ *coincides with recession cone* $\mathrm{T}(D)$ *and is defined over* $\mathbb{Q}$*. In particular,* Δ *acts on the affine space* $A/\mathrm{As}(D)$ *via a finite quotient.*

Proof. If $\mathrm{T}(D) = \{0\}$, then D is bounded and there is nothing to show. We proceed with induction on the dimension of D and assume that $\mathrm{T}(D) \neq \{0\}$. We first show that $\mathrm{T}(D)$ is linear space. If that is not the case, then let $R \subset \mathrm{T}(D)$ be ray such that line spanned by it is not contained in $\mathrm{T}(D)$. Choose an open ball $B \subset D$. Then for any integer $n > 0$, there exists in $B + R$ an interval $[x_n, y_n]$ whose end points lie in L and which contains at least $n + 1$ lattice points. Denote by Φ the collection of affine linear maps $A \to \mathbb{R}$ that are integral on L, whose linear part is positive on $\mathrm{T}(D) - \mathrm{As}(D)$ and whose minimum on $D \cap L$ is 0. This is a nonempty Δ-invariant set and so if $x \in D \cap L$, then the nonnegative integer $\min_{f \in \Phi} f(x)$ only depends on the orbit $\Delta.x$. We write $m(\Delta.x)$ for this number. Now for every $f \in \Phi$, $f(y_n) \geq n + f(x_n) \geq n$ and so $m(\Delta.y_n) \geq n$. This contradicts the fact that Δ has finitely many orbits in $D \cap L$.

The same argument shows that $\mathrm{T}(D)$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. If $\pi : A \to A/\mathrm{T}(D)$ is the projection, then $D = \pi^{-1}\pi D$, and so we must have $\mathrm{T}(\pi D) =$

$\{0\}$. This implies that $\pi(D)$ is bounded, in other words $\mathrm{As}(D) \subset \mathrm{T}(D)$. The opposite inclusion is clear. □

Corollary 5.9. *Suppose that in the situation of the previous proposition* Δ *acts on* D *with compact fundamental domain. Then* $D = A$.

Proof. Following Proposition 5.8, $W := \mathrm{T}(D)$ is a subspace defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, D is bounded modulo W and Δ acts on A/W via a finite group. As it acts with compact fundamental domain on D/W, it follows that D/W is compact. But D/W is open in the affine space A/W, and so this can only happen if D/W is a singleton, i.e. if $D = A$. □

Corollary 5.10. *The closure of* $F^\dagger$ *in* V^* *is just the set of* $\xi \in C^*$ *which vanish on* F *(and hence is an exposed face of* C^**), and* $\pi_F(C)$ *is invariant under the translations in* T_F.

Proof. Let $\tilde{A}$ be an affine subspace of V parallel to V^F which is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ and meets C. We let denote the images of $\tilde{A}$, $L\cap\tilde{A}$ and $C\cap\tilde{A}$ in V/V_F by A, $A(\mathbb{Z})$ and D respectively. It follows from Proposition 5.6 that D is also the image of $C_+ \cap \tilde{A}$. If Σ and σ are chosen as in Lemma 5.3, then according to that lemma the restriction of $\pi_F(\Sigma_\sigma)$ to D is a decomposition into compact rational polyhedra which is finite modulo $Z_\Gamma(F, F^\dagger)$. So corollary 5.9 applies and we find that $D = A$. If we combine this with the fact that $\pi_F(C)$ is convex, the second assertion follows.

The set of $\xi \in C^*$ which vanish on F is an exposed face of C^* which contains $F^\dagger$. Any such ξ can be regarded as a linear form on V/V_F which is nonnegative on $\pi_F C$. Since $\pi_F C$ is invariant under translations in T_F, it follows that ξ vanishes on V^F. So ξ is in the linear span of $F^\dagger$. The latter intersects C^* in the closure of $F^\dagger$, and thus the corollary follows. □

Lemma 5.11. *The unipotent elements in* $Z_\Gamma(F, F^\dagger)$ *form a normal subgroup of finite index.*

Proof. We claim that it suffices to prove that every eigen value of every $\gamma \in Z_\Gamma(F, F^\dagger)$ has absolute value one. For then the characteristic polynomial of γ has integral coefficients, and all its roots lie on the unit circle. This implies that this polynomial is a product of cyclotomic polynomials. Since there are only finitely many such polynomials of given degree, it follows that the set of eigen values of elements of $Z_\Gamma(F, F^\dagger)$ is finite. Now choose a strictly increasing (Jordan-Hölder) filtration $0 = W_0 \subset W_1 \subset \dots \subset V(\mathbb{C})$ invariant under $Z_\Gamma(F, F^\dagger)$ such that the image G_i of $Z_\Gamma(F, F^\dagger)$ in $GL(W_i/W_{i-1})$ is irreducible. Clearly, the set of traces of elements of G_i is finite and a well-known fact of representation theory (see for instance, [4], proof of Burnside's theorem (36.1)) then implies that G_i is finite. Hence the group of $\gamma \in Z_\Gamma(F, F^\dagger)$ that act trivially on the quotients G_i/G_{i-1} is of finite index in Γ and coincides with the set of its unipotent elements. (This argument was pointed out to me by O. Gabber.)

So it remains to prove that every eigenvalue of $\gamma \in Z_\Gamma(F, F^\dagger)$ has absolute value one. Suppose this is not so: let $m > 1$ the maximal absolute value that occurs and denote by W the corresponding eigen space of γ in V^*. Since γ acts trivially on F, we have $W \subset \mathrm{Ann}(F)$. Now choose a half line in C^* which is not contained in a proper eigen space of γ. Then the translates of this half line under the positive powers of γ have a limiting half line contained in $W \cap C^*$, and hence contained in $\mathrm{Ann}(F) \cap C^*$. According to Corollary 5.10, this last intersection equals the closure of $F^\dagger$ in V^*. So $W \cap F^\dagger \neq \{0\}$. But this is impossible as γ leaves $F^\dagger$ pointwise fixed. □

We denote the set of unipotent elements of $Z_\Gamma(F, F^\dagger)$ by $U_\Gamma(F)$. It follows from Corollary 5.4 and Lemma 5.11 that 'up to finite groups' the Γ-normalizer of F is an extension of $\Gamma(F) \times \Gamma(F^\dagger)$ by $U_\Gamma(F)$. We shall now concentrate on the action of the latter on V. We will find among other things that this group is abelian.

Most of our information is obtained via the following proposition. In this proposition we regard the space of rays in a vector space as the boundary (the sphere at infinity) of any affine space over that vector space.

Proposition 5.12. *Let A be a real affine space of finite dimension (with translation space denoted T), $T_0 \subset T$ a linear subspace and U a unipotent group of affine-linear transformations of A which leaves T_0 pointwise fixed and is such that A/T_0 is spanned by some U-orbit. Let be given a closed nondegenerate convex cone $C_0 \subset T_0$ for which there exists a nonempty U-invariant open subset $D \subset A$ with the property that any ray in T that is a limiting point of a U-orbit in D, lies in C_0. Put $A' := A/T_0$ and $T' := T/T_0$ and $a \in A \mapsto a' \in A'$ resp. $t \in T \mapsto t' \in T'$ denote the obvious projections.*

Then the 'realification' $U(\mathbb{R})$ of U acts faithfully on A' as a group of translations of maximal rank; in particular, $U(\mathbb{R})$ acts trivially on T/T_0, and we have a resulting identification $u \in U(\mathbb{R}) \mapsto [u] \in T'$. Moreover, there exists a unique map

$$\sigma : A' \times T' \to T$$

with the following properties.

a) *σ is affine-linear in the first variable and for every $a \in A$, $\sigma_{a'} : T' \to T$ is a linear section of the projection $T \to T'$ and so σ induces a bilinear map*

$$d\sigma : T' \times T' \to T_0$$

characterized by the property that for $a' \in A'$ and $t_1', t_2' \in T'$, $\sigma(a' + t_1', t_2') = \sigma(a', t_1') + d\sigma(t_1', t_2')$.

b) *$d\sigma$ is a C_0-*positive *symmetric form in the sense that it is symmetric, and for every nonzero $t' \in T'$, we have $d\sigma(t', t') \in C_0 - \{0\}$, and*

c) *if $u \in U(\mathbb{R})$ is identified with $[u] \in T'$, then for all $a \in A$,*

$$u(a) = a + \sigma(\pi(a), [u]) + \tfrac{1}{2} d\sigma([u], [u]).$$

Proof. Since U leaves T_0 pointwise fixed, so does $U(\mathbb{R})$. Choose a compact $K \subset U(\mathbb{R})$ such that $U(\mathbb{R}) = U \cdot K$. Then $U(\mathbb{R}).D = K.D$ and since $U(\mathbb{R})$ leaves T_0 pointwise fixed, any ray in T that is a limiting point of a $U(\mathbb{R})$-orbit in $K.D$ must lie in C_0. So we may as well assume that $U = U(\mathbb{R})$.

We use induction on $\dim(T')$. To start the induction, assume $T' = \{0\}$. Then U must act on A as a group of translations. As U preserves D, it follows that $U = \{1\}$ and we are done.

From now on we assume $T' \neq \{0\}$ and $U \neq \{1\}$. Then $T_0 \neq \{0\}$, for the orbit of a unipotent transformation is either a singleton or has a limiting point at infinity.

Since U is unipotent, we can find a U-invariant hyperplane T_1 of T containing T_0. Then U acts trivially on T/T_1 and hence acts on A/T_1 as a group of translations. We denote the ensueing homomorphism $U \to T/T_1$ by α and write U_1 for its kernel. Choose a T_1-orbit A_1 in A which intersects D. Clearly U_1 leaves A_1 invariant and one verifies easily that the triple $(A_1, D \cap A_1, U_1)$ fulfills the hypotheses of the proposition. So by induction U_1 acts faithfully on $A_1' := A_1/T_0$ as its full group of translations.

We can now prove the first assertion. Choose $a \in D$, and put $e_i := (u-1)^i(a)$. Then $e_1 \in T$, $e_2 \in T_1$, $e_3 \in T_0$, and $e_i = 0$ for $i \geq 4$. So

$$u^k(a) = a + \binom{k}{1} e_1 + \binom{k}{2} e_2 + \binom{k}{3} e_3$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $e_3 \neq 0$, then the closure of $\{u^k(a) | k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ in $\bar{A}$ contains the classes of both e_3 and $-e_3$, in other words $\pm e_3 \in C_0$. Since C_0 contains no antipodal pairs other than the origin, this is impossible. So $e_3 = 0$. By a similar argument it follows that $e_2 \in C_0$. Since this is true for all $a \in D$, it follows that u induces a translation in A'. If this translation is trivial, then $e_1 \in T_0$, and hence $e_2 = 0$. But then $\pm e_1 \in C_0$, and so $e_1 = 0$. This proves that U acts faithfully on A'. Since U acts on this space as a group of translations with compact fundamental domain, it can be identified with the full group of translations of A'.

To prove the remaining assertions, fix $a_0 \in A$, and a linear section $s : T' \to T$ of $T \to T'$. Then A is parameterized by

$$(t', t_0) \in T' \times T_0 \mapsto a_0 + s(t') + t_0 \in A.$$

In terms of this parameterization the action of U on A is then given by

$$u(a_0 + s(t') + t_0) = a_0 + s(t' + [u]) + t_0 + \phi_u(a_0 + s(t')),$$

where ϕ_u is an affine-linear map from A to T_0. The map ϕ_u factors over $A \to A'$ and is independent of a_0. So we can write $\phi_u(a) = \phi(a', u')$. Then the fact that $u, v \in U$ commute implies the symmetry of $d\phi$. In particular, ϕ is linear in the second variable. Hence for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$u^k(a_0) = a_0 + ks(u') + k\phi_u(a_0) + \tfrac{1}{2}k(k-1)d\phi([u],[u]),$$

where $u' \in T'$ denotes the image of $u \in U$

Suppose $u \in U(\mathbb{R}) - \{1\}$ nonzero. If $d\phi([u],[u]) = 0$, then the displayed formula shows that the orbit $\{u^k(a_0) | k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ has two opposite limiting rays (spanned by $\pm(s(u') + \phi_u(a_0))$), which evidently contradicts our assumption. So $d\phi([u],[u]) = 0$ is nonzero, and the same formula above shows that it must belong to C_0. So if we define σ by $\sigma(a', t') := s(t') + \phi(a', t')$, then σ has the asserted properties (the uniqueness of σ is easy). □

We return to the face F and recall that $T_F := V^F/V_F$.

Corollary 5.13. *$U_\Gamma(F)(\mathbb{R})$ acts trivially on T_F , so that we can define homomorphisms of groups*

$$j : U_\Gamma(F)(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{Hom}(V/V^F, T_F) \text{ such that } u(x') = x' + j_u q_F(x'),$$
$$k : U_\Gamma(F)(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{Hom}(T_F, V_F) \text{ such that } u(y) = y + k_u \pi_F(y).$$

with $x \in V$ and $y \in V^F$. Moreover, if $x \in C$, then its image x'' in V/V^F has the property that the map $u \in U_\Gamma(F)(\mathbb{R}) \mapsto j_u(x'') \in T_F$ is an isomorphism of groups.

Proof. Let $x'' \in C(F)$, let A denote its pre-image in V, and set $D = A \cap C$. Then D is a nonempty open convex subset of A and by 5.10 we have $\mathrm{T}(D) = \bar{C} \cap V^F = \bar{F}$. It follows from part (ii) of Lemma 5.3 that $U_\Gamma(F)$ acts with compact fundamental set on the image of D in A/V_F. Hence Proposition 5.12 applies (with $C = \bar{F}$) and we find that $U_\Gamma(F)(\mathbb{R})$ acts in A/V_F faithfully as the full group T_F of translations. □

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let $s : T_F \to V^F$ be a linear section of the projection. Since $u \in U_\Gamma(F)(\mathbb{R})$ acts trivially on V_F, and as $x' \mapsto x' + j_u(x'')$ on V/V_F, it follows that there exists a $\phi_u \in \mathrm{Hom}(V/V_F, V_F)$ such that

$$u(x) = x + sj_u(x'') + \phi_u(x' + \tfrac{1}{2}j_u(x'')).$$

Since u acts on V^F as $x \mapsto x + k_u(x')$, the restriction of ϕ_u to T_F must be k_u. So $\phi_u j_u(x'') = \frac{1}{2}k_u j_u(x'')$. If we set

$$\sigma_u(x') := sj_u(x'') + \phi_u(x'),$$

then it also follows that the restriction of σ_u to T_F is k_u. It is clear that the map $V/V^F \to V/V_F$ induced by σ_u is precisely j_u. So σ_u has the property (i). The assertion that σ_u is unique for these properties is obvious.

If $u, v \in U_\Gamma(F)(\mathbb{R})$, then

$$v(\sigma_u(x')) = \sigma_u(x') + k_v(\sigma_u(x')') = \sigma_u(x') + k_v j_u(x''),$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} vu(x) &= v(x + \sigma_u(x') + \tfrac{1}{2}k_u j_u(x'')) \\ &= x + \sigma_v(x') + \tfrac{1}{2}k_v j_v(x') + \sigma_u(x') + k_v j_u(x'') + \tfrac{1}{2}k_u j_u(x'') \\ &= x + (\sigma_u + \sigma_v)(x') + \tfrac{1}{2}(k_u j_u + 2k_v j_u + k_v j_v)(x''). \end{aligned}$$

Since $vu = uv$, the symmetry property (ii) follows. As σ_{vu} is characterized by

$$vu(x) = x + \sigma_{vu}(x') + \tfrac{1}{2}(k_u + k_v)(j_u + j_v)(x'').$$

this also yields the linearity of σ. The same formula shows that for $r \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$u^r(x) = x + r\sigma_u(x') + \tfrac{1}{2}r^2 k_u j_u(x'').$$

Property (iii) follows from this. □

A case of interest is when Γ stabilizes a *proper* face F of C_+ (that is, $\{0\} \subsetneq F \subsetneq C_+$). Then Theorem 5.1 shows that Γ is almost an extension of $\Gamma(F) \times \Gamma(F^\dagger)$ by the abelian unipotent group $U_\Gamma(F)$ (of rank equal $\dim T_F$). If take F minimal for this property, then $\Gamma(F)$ leaves no proper face of F invariant; if we take F maximal for this property, then $\Gamma(F^\dagger)$ leaves no proper face of F^d invariant. In this way can often reduce our discussion to the case when no a proper face F of C_+ is preserved by Γ.

We can take this one a step further by reducing to the irreducible case.

Definition 5.14. We say that a triple (V, C, Γ) is of polyhedral type is *irreducible* if Γ does not leave invariant any proper subspace of V defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Suppose $W \subset V$ is a proper Γ-invariant subspace defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. We distinguish three cases. If W meets C_+ in a proper face (F, say), then Γ stabilizes F, a case we discussed above. There remains:

(a) If $W \cap \bar{C} = \{0\}$, then the projection $\pi_W : V \to V/W$ maps C onto a nondegenerate open cone and the triple $(V/W, \pi_W(C), \Gamma)$ is of polyhedral type

(b) If dually, $W \cap C \neq \emptyset$, then $(W, C \cap W, \Gamma)$ is of polyhedral type.

We observe that Γ acts with finite kernel on V/W resp. W. In case (b) this is clear, because W meets the locus where Γ acts properly discontinuously and case (a) then follows by duality.

Remark 5.15. This reduction procedure is of interest in case $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{GL}(T)$ is the standard representation of an irreducible infinite Coxeter group (see [3]). Then Γ preserves a nondegenerate convex cone C_+ in T^* (the Tits cone) on which it acts with a simplicial cone (a Weyl chamber) as a strict fundamental domain. The Tits cone has a nonempty interior on which Γ acts properly discontinuously. This representation need not stabilize a lattice, but if it does, then C_+ is as in this paper. The construction also comes with a nonzero symmetric bilinear form $B : T \times T \to \mathbb{R}$ preserved by Γ. If Γ is not of affine type, then it is known that the image of the map $b : T \to T^*$ adjoint to B meets C. In other words, we are in the situation of (b). The group Γ acts even faithfully on $b(T)$ and so preserves a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form. Observe that a Weyl chamber meets $b(T)$ in general in a polyhedral cone (rather than in a simplicial cone).

References

[1] A. Ash, D. Mumford, M. Rapoport, Y. Tai: *Smooth Compactification of Locally Symmetric Varieties*, Math. Sci. Press, Brookline (Mass.), 1975.

[2] A. Borel: *Introduction aux groupes arithmétiques*, Publications de l'Institut de Mathématique de l'Université de Strasbourg, XV. Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, 1341 Hermann, Paris 1969 125 pp.

[3] N. Bourbaki: *Groupes et algèbres de Lie,* Ch. 4-6, Hermann, Paris (1969).

[4] C.W. Curtis, I. Reiner: *Methods of representation theory. Vol. I*, Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1981. xxi+819 pp.

[5] G. Kempf, F. Knudsen, D. Mumford, B. Saint-Donat: *Toroidal embeddings I*, Lecture Notes in Math. 339, Springer Verlag, 1973.

[6] E. Looijenga: *Invariant theory for generalized root systems*, Invent. Math. 61 (1980), 1–32.

[7] E. Looijenga: *Semitoric partial compactifications I*, Preprint University of Nijmegen (June 1985).

[8] E. Looijenga: *New compactifications of locally symmetric varieties*, in: Proceedings of the 1984 Vancouver conference in algebraic geometry, 341–364, CMS Conf. Proc. 6, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1986.

[9] D.R. Morrison: *Compactifications of moduli spaces inspired by mirror symmetry,* Astérisque 218 (1993), 243–271.

[10] Y. Namikawa: *Periods of Enriques surfaces,* Math. Ann. 270 (1985), 201–222.

[11] R.T. Rockafellar: *Convex Analysis*, Princeton Mathematical Series 28, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1970 xviii+451 pp.

[12] H. Sterk: *Finiteness results for algebraic* K3 *surfaces,* Math. Z. 189 (1985),507–513.

[13] E.B. Vinberg: *Discrete linear groups generated by reflections*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, ser. mat. 35 (1972), 1072–1112.

[14] E.B. Vinberg: *The groups of units of certain quadratic forms*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) 87 (129) (1972), 18–36.

[15] E.B. Vinberg: *Convex homogeneous domains*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 141 (1961), 521–524.

Mathematisch Instituut, Universiteit Utrecht, P.O. Box 80.010, NL-3508 TA Utrecht (Nederland)

E-mail address: `E.J.N.Looijeng@uu.nl`